



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,357	06/27/2003	Padma Prabodh Varanasi	J-3866	7780
28165	7590	09/05/2008		
S.C. JOHNSON & SON, INC. 1525 HOWE STREET RACINE, WI 53403-2236				
EXAMINER				
CHORBAJ, MONZER R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1797				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/05/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/608,357

**Applicant(s)**

VARANASI ET AL.

**Examiner**

MONZER R. CHORBAJI

**Art Unit**

1797

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 and 40-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 and 40-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 October 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

**This non-final action is in response to the amendment received on 5/19/08**

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-24, 37-38, and 40-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The disclosure teaches the volume unit as presented in the equation on page 4. However, there is no mention of time rate (seconds) for volume only that time rate is related to distance unit (meters) and one of ordinary skill in the art reading the disclosure would not be able to ascertain that a volumetric rate is taught in the specification only to see that the unit for evaporation rate is meters per second.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1, 2, 4, and 7-11, 13, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Triplett et al (U.S.P.N. 6,697,571) in view of Demarest et al (U.S.P.N. 6,361,752) and Gillett et al (U.S.P.N. 5,402,517)

Regarding claims 1 and 13, Triplett discloses an article of manufacture (figure 3:10) that is plugged in a conventional electrical outlet (col.4, lines 60-62) comprising: a housing (figure 3:12); the volatile liquid in a reservoir (col.4, lines 42-46), a wick (22) extending from the reservoir upwardly in the housing, and a heater (20) in the housing, electrically connected to the plug unit (18). The volatile liquid has an evaporation rate

between about  $5.0 \times 10^{-9}$  and about  $10.0 \times 10^{-9}$  meters per second measured where the top of the wick is at a distance 1.5 cm from the top of the heating element. Using a wick length of 1.0 cm (the wick is considered to have a certain volume of fragrance present within it), which represent the amount of exposed wick that is considered to contain an initial amount of fragrance at the first day of 15 days time interval and dividing 1.0 cm by 15 days, the rate of evaporation is  $7 \times 10^{-9}$  m/s. See Table 2. This rate falls within the claimed range. Calculation is done as follows:  $(1\text{cm}/15\text{days}) \times (1\text{day}/1440\text{min}) \times (1\text{min}/60\text{sec}) \times (0.01\text{m}/1\text{cm}) = 7 \times 10^{-9}$  m/s. As to the newly added unit of  $(\text{m}^3/\text{m}^2)/\text{s}$ , further division of the units in this compound fracture results in having the unit as m/s, which is the same as the unit provided in the calculations in the Triplett reference.

Triplett is silent with respect to the following: the inclusion of a fan, the method of calculating his various evaporation rates, (for example, measuring and calculating by drop shape analysis), the amount of volatile material carried within the enclosed reservoir, and the wick extending between the volatile liquid and the air stream.

Demarest discloses a volatile liquid vaporizing device (figure 9:130) where a wick (figure 9:144) is extending between the volatile liquid (unlabeled volatile liquid material within vessel 136 in figure 9) and the air stream, which is created by the fan shown as 156 in figure 9. The use of a fan creates a flow of air through the housing and across the carrier material where vapors from the material are drawn into the air flow through the housing and are exhausted into the ambient environment (col.8, lines 61-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further provide a fan into the housing of Triplett, since the use of a fan creates a flow of

air through the housing and across the carrier material where vapors from the material are drawn into the air flow through the housing and is exhausted into the ambient environment as shown by Demarest (col.8, lines 61-67).

Triplett and Demarest do not specifically disclose an amount of volatile material carried within the reservoir or enclosed vessel.

Gillett discloses a fragrance vaporizing apparatus (col.1, lines 8-9) having a cylindrical housing (figure 1:48) into which a suitable amount of volatile liquid material between 1 to 20 ml is added (col.4, lines 29-30). With this volume range of volatile material, the heating element is able to control the rate of vaporization of the chemical agent and thereby extend the dispensing of the fragrance material well over 30 days (col.1, lines 26-30 and col.3, lines 35-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further provide an amount of volatile material between 1 to 20 ml into the reservoir unit of Triplett as modified by Demarest, since within this volume range of volatile material, the heating element is able to control the rate of vaporization of the chemical agent and thereby extend the dispensing of the fragrance material well over 30 days (col.1, lines 26-30 and col.3, lines 35-37).

With respect to the measurement and calculation of the evaporation rate being done by drop shape analysis based on 30% of the volatile liquid remaining at room temperature, Triplett, Demarest and Gillett are all silent. However, the evaporation rate of the solution based on about 30% remaining liquid at room temperature is considered a limitation which is not attributable to the device being claimed. As such, the

measurement and calculation method employed is not given any patentable weight in a claim to the device.

Triplett does teach an evaporation rate of the solution being within the range recited by applicant.

Furthermore, as to the limitation that about 90% of the volatile liquid is capable of evaporating through the wick between within one and two months under ambient conditions when the wick is exposed to the surrounding environment, Triplett exposes the wick (figure 3:22) to the surrounding environment (wick 14 is exposed to the surrounding environment through vent system 16 as shown in figure 3). Triplett further teaches (col.7, lines 16-19) that the amount of evaporation of the fragrance is over 62 days or less (see table 2 and col.7, lines 16-19). As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that at least 90% of the volatile liquid must evaporate within 2 months. Therefore, 90% of the volatile liquid material is capable of evaporating through the wick within one and two months under ambient conditions within the modified device of Triplett.

As to claim 2, Triplett discloses an evaporation rate between about  $1.0 \times 10^{-8}$  to about  $7.0 \times 10^{-8}$  meters per second. See Table 2, where the top of the wick (the wick is considered to have a certain volume of fragrance present within it) is at a distance 1.5 cm from the top of the heating element. Using 1.0 cm, which represent the amount of exposed wick that is considered to contain an initial amount of fragrance at the first day of 7 days time interval and dividing 1.0 cm by 7 days, the rate of evaporation is  $1.6 \times 10^{-8}$  m/s. This rate falls within the claimed range. Calculation is done as follows: (1cm/7days)

$\times (1\text{day}/1440\text{min}) \times (1\text{ min}/60\text{sec}) \times (0.01\text{m}/1\text{cm}) = 1.6 \times 10^{-8} \text{ m/s}$ ]. Within the reservoir (figure 3:14) is used to measure the rate of evaporation. As to the newly added unit of  $(\text{m}^3/\text{m}^2)/\text{s}$ , further division of the units in this compound fracture results in having the unit as m/s, which is the same as the unit provided in the calculations in the Triplett reference.

Regarding claim 4, Demarest's fan is capable of exhibiting various throughputs volumetric flow rates including the range of about 0.4 cubic feet per minute to about 0.45 cubic feet per minute. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further provide the fan in the modified device housing of Triplett with the specific flow rate recited in order to provide an optimum vaporization rate of the volatile liquid

Regarding claims 7-8 and 20-21, Triplett teaches that the volatile material is fragrance or insecticide (col.4, lines 43-46).

Regarding claim 9, Triplett teaches that the volatile liquid container (figure 3:14) is releasably secured (col.3, lines 56-58) to the housing (figure 3:12).

Regarding claim 10, where the limitation that about 90% of the volatile liquid is capable of evaporating through the wick in about 2 months under ambient conditions, Triplett exposes the wick (figure 3:22) to the surrounding environment (wick 14 is exposed to the surrounding environment through vent system 16 as shown in figure 3). Triplett further teaches (col.7, lines 16-19) that the amount of evaporation of the fragrance is over 62 days or less (see table 2 and col.7, lines 16-19). As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that at least 90% of the volatile liquid



must evaporate in about 2 months. Therefore, 90% of the volatile liquid material is capable of evaporating through the wick within one and two months under ambient conditions within the modified device of Triplett.

Regarding claim 11, Triplett as modified by Demarest and Gillett do not specifically teach the alignment of the wick with the fan. It would appear however, that Demarest teaches that the wick is in alignment with fan (the upper part 146 of wick 144 is immersed into the air stream created by fan 156 in figure 9 where both the wick and the fan are aligned along an imaginary z-axis). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further provide the fan in the modified device of Triplett in alignment with the fan in order to improve distribution of the volatile liquid.

7. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Triplett et al (U.S.P.N. 6,697,571) in view of Demarest et al (U.S.P.N. 6,361,752) and Gillett et al (U.S.P.N. 5,402,517) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Lang (U.S.P.N. 7,018,644).

Triplett, Demarest and Gillett are silent with regard to specifically disclose a relative evaporation rate. It is noted that evaporation rate is a process limitation and not attributed patentable weight in a claim to the device. However, such evaporation rates are conventional in this art. See for example, Lang who discloses air freshener and insecticidal liquid compositions that are used in air freshening evaporative devices (col.1, lines 15-18). The composition is made up of a polar solvent, non-polar solvent, and a fragrance or an insecticide (col.2, lines 64-67). The components of the

composition have evaporation rates that are relative to n-butyl acetate (col.4, lines 15-25 or col.6, lines 8-9. This is considered the relative evaporation rate) as such (See the Table in Example 1. For example, a non-polar solvent, Isopar M, has a relative evaporation rate of less than 1, and a polar solvent, Dowanol DPM, has a relative evaporation rate of 3). It is particularly desirable for the composition to be formulated such that no residue of the solvent remains (col.2, lines 51-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further provide the apparatus in Triplett with the polar/non-polar liquid composition, because upon complete evaporation no residues of the solvent remains within the device (col.2, lines 51-55).

8. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Triplett et al (U.S.P.N. 6,697,571) in view of Demarest et al (U.S.P.N. 6,361,752) and Gillett et al (U.S.P.N. 5,402,517) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Ito et al (U.S.P.N. 6,391,329).

Regarding claims 5-6, Triplett, Demarest, and Gillett do not specifically teach the use of a fan that is operated intermittently. Ito's insecticide device uses a fan (figure 1:3) that is operated intermittently (col.12, lines 58-60) in order to attain an equilibrium concentration within the first 30-minute period and thereafter keeps releasing uniformly and stably over 360 hours (col.13, lines 6-10). Furthermore, Ito's fan is capable of operating the air stream in an on and off of different ratio time intervals, including the ratio interval of about 1 minute to 3 minutes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the modified article of

manufacture in Triplett with an intermittent operating fan in order to attain an equilibrium concentration within the first 30-minute period and thereafter keeps releasing uniformly and stably over 360 hours as taught by Ito (col.13, lines 6-10).

9. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Triplett et al (U.S.P.N. 6,697,571) in view of Demarest et al (U.S.P.N. 6,361,752) and Gillett et al (U.S.P.N. 5,402,517 as applied to claim 11 and further in view He et al (US 2002/0136886 A1).

Triplett, Demarest and Gillett are silent about disclosing range values for the mean pore size of wicks. He dispenses fragrance material [0011] using polymeric wicks [0009] having average pore size from about 2 to about 70 microns [0057], because in such a pore range polymeric wicks showed no substantial fluid leakage upon inversion [0055]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the article of manufacture in Triplett with a wick having an average pore size from about 2 to about 70 microns in order to have a polymeric wick that shows no substantial fluid leakage upon inversion as taught by He [0055].

10. Claims 13-14 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Triplett et al (U.S.P.N. 6,697,571).

Regarding claims 13 and 14, Triplett discloses an article of manufacture (figure 3:10) that is plugged in a conventional electrical outlet (col.4, lines 60-62) comprising: a housing (figure 3:12); the volatile liquid in a reservoir (col.4, lines 42-46), a wick (22) extending from the reservoir upwardly in the housing, and a heater (20) in the housing, electrically connected to the plug unit (18). The volatile liquid has an evaporation rate

between about  $5.0 \times 10^{-9}$  and about  $10.0 \times 10^{-9}$  meters per second measured where the top of the wick is at a distance 1.5 cm from the top of the heating element. Using a wick (the wick is considered to have a certain volume of fragrance present within it) length of 1.0 cm, which represent the amount of exposed wick that is considered to contain an initial amount of fragrance at the first day of 15 days time interval and dividing 1.0 cm by 15 days, the rate of evaporation is  $7 \times 10^{-9}$  m/s. See Table 2. This rate falls within the claimed range. Calculation is done as follows:  $(1\text{cm}/15\text{days}) \times (1\text{day}/1440\text{min}) \times (1\text{min}/60\text{sec}) \times (0.01\text{m}/1\text{cm}) = 7 \times 10^{-9}$  m/s. As to the newly added unit of  $(\text{m}^3/\text{m}^2)/\text{s}$ , further division of the units in this compound fracture results in having the unit as m/s, which is the same as the unit provided in the calculations in the Triplett reference.

Triplett is silent with respect to the following: the inclusion of a fan, the amount of volatile material carried within the enclosed reservoir, the method of calculating his various evaporation rates, (for example, measuring and calculating by drop shape analysis), and the wick extending between the volatile liquid and the air stream.

Demarest discloses a volatile liquid vaporizing device (figure 9:130) where a wick (figure 9:144) is extending between the volatile liquid (unlabeled volatile liquid material within vessel 136 in figure 9) and the air stream, which is created by the fan shown as 156 in figure 9. The use of a fan creates a flow of air through the housing and across the carrier material where vapors from the material are drawn into the air flow through the housing and are exhausted into the ambient environment (col.8, lines 61-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further provide a fan into the housing of Triplett, since the use of a fan creates a flow of

air through the housing and across the carrier material where vapors from the material are drawn into the air flow through the housing and is exhausted into the ambient environment as shown by Demarest (col.8, lines 61-67).

Triplett and Demarest do not specifically disclose an amount of volatile material carried within the reservoir or enclosed vessel.

Gillett discloses a fragrance vaporizing apparatus (col.1, lines 8-9) having a cylindrical housing (figure 1:48) into which a suitable amount of volatile liquid material between 1 to 20 ml is added (col.4, lines 29-30). With this volume range of volatile material, the heating element is able to control the rate of vaporization of the chemical agent and thereby extend the dispensing of the fragrance material well over 30 days (col.1, lines 26-30 and col.3, lines 35-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further provide an amount of volatile material between 1 to 20 ml into the reservoir unit of Triplett as modified by Demarest, since within this volume range of volatile material, the heating element is able to control the rate of vaporization of the chemical agent and thereby extend the dispensing of the fragrance material well over 30 days (col.1, lines 26-30 and col.3, lines 35-37).

With respect to the measurement and calculation of the evaporation rate being done by drop shape analysis based on 30% of the volatile liquid remaining at room temperature, Triplett, Demarest and Gillett are all silent. However, the evaporation rate of the solution based on about 30% remaining liquid at room temperature is considered a limitation which is not attributable to the device being claimed. As such, the

measurement and calculation method employed is not given any patentable weight in a claim to the device.

Triplett does teach an evaporation rate of the solution being within the range recited by applicant.

Furthermore, as to the limitation that about 90% of the volatile liquid is capable of evaporating through the wick between within one and two months under ambient conditions when the wick is exposed to the surrounding environment, Triplett exposes the wick (figure 3:22) to the surrounding environment (wick 14 is exposed to the surrounding environment through vent system 16 as shown in figure 3). Triplett further teaches (col.7, lines 16-19) that the amount of evaporation of the fragrance is over 62 days or less (see table 2 and col.7, lines 16-19). As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that at least 90% of the volatile liquid must evaporate within 2 months. Therefore, 90% of the volatile liquid material is capable of evaporating through the wick within one and two months under ambient conditions within the modified device of Triplett.

Regarding claims 20-21, Triplett teaches that the volatile material is fragrance or insecticide (col.4, lines 43-46).

Regarding claim 22, Triplett teaches that the volatile liquid container (figure 3:14) is releasably secured (col.3, lines 56-58) to the housing (figure 3:12).

**11.** Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Triplett et al (U.S.P.N. 6,697,571) as applied to claim 13 and further in view of Lang (U.S.P.N. 7,018,644).

Triplett is silent with regard to specifically disclose a relative evaporation rate. Lang discloses air freshener and insecticidal liquid compositions that are used in air freshening evaporative devices (col.1, lines 15-18) where the composition is made up of a polar solvent, non-polar solvent, and a fragrance or an insecticide (col.2, lines 64-67). The components of the composition have evaporation rates that are relative to n-butyl acetate (co.4, lines 15-25 or col.6, lines 8-9. This is considered the relative evaporation rate) as such (See the Table in Example 1. For example, a non-polar solvent ,Isopar M, has a relative evaporation rate of less than 1, and a polar solvent, Dowanol DPM, has a relative evaporation rate of 3) it is particularly desirable for the composition to be formulated such that no residue of the solvent remains (col.2, lines 51-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further provide the device in Triplett with the polar/non-polar liquid composition, because upon complete evaporation no residues of the solvent remains within the device (col.2, lines 51-55).

**12.** Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Triplett et al (U.S.P.N. 6,697,571) as applied to claim 13 and further in view of Demarest (U.S.P.N. 6,361,752).

Triplett does not specifically disclose using a fan. Demarest discloses a volatile liquid vaporizing device (figure 9:130) using a fan (figure 9:156), since the use of a fan creates a flow of air through the housing and across the carrier material where vapors from the material are drawn into the air flow through the housing and is exhausted into the ambient environment (col.8, lines 61-67). In addition, Demarest's fan is capable of

exhibiting various throughputs volumetric flow rates including the range of about 0.4 cubic feet per minute to about 0.45 cubic feet per minute. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further provide a fan into the housing of Triplett, since the use of a fan creates a flow of air through the housing and across the carrier material where vapors from the material are drawn into the air flow through the housing and is exhausted into the ambient environment as shown by Demarest (col.8, lines 61-67).

**13.** Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Triplett et al (U.S.P.N. 6,697,571) as applied to claim 13 and further in view of Ito et al (U.S.P.N. 6,391,329).

Regarding claims 18-19, Triplett does not specifically teach the use of a fan that is operated intermittently. Ito's insecticide device uses a fan (figure 1:3) that is operated intermittently (col.12, lines 58-60) in order to attain an equilibrium concentration within the first 30-minute period and thereafter keeps releasing uniformly and stably over 360 hours (col.13, lines 6-10). Furthermore, Ito's fan is capable of operating the air stream in an on and off of different ratio time intervals, including the ratio time interval of about 1 minute to 3 minutes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the article of manufacture in Triplett with an intermittent operating fan in order to attain an equilibrium concentration within the first 30-minute period and thereafter keeps releasing uniformly and stably over 360 hours as taught by Ito (col.13, lines 6-10).



**14.** Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Triplett et al (U.S.P.N. 6,697,571) as applied to claim 13 and further in view of Gillett et al (U.S.P.N. 5,402,517).

Triplett is silent with respect to the amount of the volatile material used. Gillett discloses a fragrance vaporizing apparatus (col.1, lines 8-9) having a cylindrical housing (figure 1:48) into which a suitable amount of volatile liquid material between 1 to 20 ml is added (col.4, lines 29-30), since within this volume range of volatile material, the heating element is able to control the rate of vaporization of the chemical agent and thereby extend the dispensing of the fragrance material well over 30 days (col.1, lines 26-30 and col.3, lines 35-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further provide an amount of volatile material between 1 to 20 ml into the reservoir unit of Triplett, since within this volume range of volatile material, the heating element is able to control the rate of vaporization of the chemical agent and thereby extend the dispensing of the fragrance material well over 30 days as explained by Gillett (col.1, lines 26-30 and col.3, lines 35-37).

**15.** Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Triplett et al (U.S.P.N. 6,697,571) as applied to claim 13 and further in view of He et al (US 2002/0136886 A1).

Triplett is silent about disclosing range values for the mean pore size of wicks. He dispenses fragrance material [0011] using polymeric wicks [0009] having average pore size from about 2 to about 70 microns [0057], because in such a pore range polymeric wicks showed no substantial fluid leakage upon inversion [0055]. It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the article of manufacture in Triplett with a wick having an average pore size from about 2 to about 70 microns in order to have a polymeric wick that shows no substantial fluid leakage upon inversion as taught by He [0055].

**16.** Claims 25-26, 28, 31-33, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Triplett et al (U.S.P.N. 6,697,571) in view of Demarest et al (U.S.P.N. 6,361,752) and further in view of Gillett et al (U.S.P.N. 5,402,517) and He et al(US 2002/0136886 A1).

Regarding claim 25, Triplett discloses an article of manufacture (figure 3:10) that is plugged in a conventional electrical outlet (col.4, lines 60-62) comprising: a housing (figure 3:12); the volatile liquid in a reservoir (col.4, lines 42-46), a wick (22) extending from the reservoir upwardly in the housing, and a heater (20) in the housing, electrically connected to the plug unit (18). The volatile liquid has an evaporation rate between about  $5.0 \times 10^{-9}$  and about  $10.0 \times 10^{-9}$  meters per second measured where the top of the wick is at a distance 1.5 cm from the top of the heating element. Using a wick length of 1.0 cm, which represent the amount of exposed wick that is considered to contain an initial amount of fragrance at the first day of 15 days time interval and dividing 1.0 cm by 15 days, the rate of evaporation is  $7 \times 10^{-9}$  m/s. See Table 2. This rate falls within the claimed range. Calculation is done as follows:  $(1\text{cm}/15\text{days}) \times (1\text{day}/1440\text{min}) \times (1\text{min}/60\text{sec}) \times (0.01\text{m}/1\text{cm}) = 7 \times 10^{-9}$  m/s.

Triplett is silent with respect to the following: the inclusion of a fan, the amount of volatile material carried within the enclosed reservoir, the method of calculating his

various evaporation rates, (for example, measuring and calculating by drop shape analysis), the makeup material for the wick, and the wick extending between the volatile liquid and the air stream.

Demarest discloses a volatile liquid vaporizing device (figure 9:130) where a wick (figure 9:144) is extending between the volatile liquid (unlabeled volatile liquid material within vessel 136 in figure 9) and the air stream, which is created by the fan shown as 156 in figure 9. The use of a fan creates a flow of air through the housing and across the carrier material where vapors from the material are drawn into the air flow through the housing and are exhausted into the ambient environment (col.8, lines 61-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further provide a fan into the housing of Triplett, since the use of a fan creates a flow of air through the housing and across the carrier material where vapors from the material are drawn into the air flow through the housing and is exhausted into the ambient environment as shown by Demarest (col.8, lines 61-67).

Triplett and Demarest do not specifically disclose an amount of volatile material carried within the reservoir or enclosed vessel.

Gillett discloses a fragrance vaporizing apparatus (col.1, lines 8-9) having a cylindrical housing (figure 1:48) into which a suitable amount of volatile liquid material between 1 to 20 ml is added (col.4, lines 29-30). With this volume range of volatile material, the heating element is able to control the rate of vaporization of the chemical agent and thereby extend the dispensing of the fragrance material well over 30 days (col.1, lines 26-30 and col.3, lines 35-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to further provide an amount of volatile material between 1 to 20 ml into the reservoir unit of Triplett as modified by Demarest, since within this volume range of volatile material, the heating element is able to control the rate of vaporization of the chemical agent and thereby extend the dispensing of the fragrance material well over 30 days (col.1, lines 26-30 and col.3, lines 35-37).

With respect to the calculation of the evaporation rate being done by drop shape analysis based on 30% of the volatile liquid remaining at room temperature, Triplett, Demarest and Gillett are all silent. However, the evaporation rate of the solution is considered a limitation which is not attributable to the device being claimed. As such, the calculation method employed is not given any patentable weight in a claim to the device.

Triplett does teach an evaporation rate of the solution being within the range recited by applicant.

Furthermore, as to the limitation that about 90% of the volatile liquid is capable of evaporating through the wick between within one and two months under ambient conditions when the wick is exposed to the surrounding environment, Triplett exposes the wick (figure 3:22) to the surrounding environment (wick 14 is exposed to the surrounding environment through vent system 16 as shown in figure 3). Triplett further teaches (col.7, lines 16-19) that the amount of evaporation of the fragrance is over 62 days or less (see table 2 and col.7, lines 16-19). As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that at least 90% of the volatile liquid must evaporate within 2 months. Therefore, 90% of the volatile liquid material is capable of evaporating through

the wick within one and two months under ambient conditions within the modified device of Triplett.

Triplett fails to teach the use of ultra high molecular weight high density polyethylene as wick material. He dispenses fragrance material [0011] using polymeric wicks [0021] having ultra high molecular weight high density polyethylene material, because such material offers substantially improved performance as well as exhibiting suitable mechanical, chemical, and thermodynamic stability [0021]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the modified article of manufacture in Triplett/Demarest/Gillett with ultra high molecular weight high density polyethylene material, because such material offers substantially improved performance as well as exhibiting suitable mechanical, chemical, and thermodynamic stability as taught by He [0021].

Regarding claim 26, Triplett discloses an evaporation rate between about  $1.0 \times 10^{-8}$  to about  $7.0 \times 10^{-8}$  meters per second. See Table 2, where the top of the wick is at a distance 1.5 cm from the top of the heating element. Using 1.0 cm, which represent the amount of exposed wick that is considered to contain an initial amount of fragrance at the first day of 7 days time interval and dividing 1.0 cm by 7 days, the rate of evaporation is  $1.6 \times 10^{-8}$  m/s. This rate falls within the claimed range. Calculation is done as follows:  $(1\text{cm}/7\text{days}) \times (1\text{day}/1440\text{min}) \times (1\text{min}/60\text{sec}) \times (0.01\text{m}/1\text{cm}) = 1.6 \times 10^{-8}$  m/s]. Within the reservoir (figure 3:14) is used to measure the rate of evaporation.

Regarding claim 28, Demarest's fan is capable of exhibiting various throughputs volumetric flow rates including the range of about 0.4 cubic feet per minute to about

0.45 cubic feet per minute. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further the article of manufacture in Triplett with a fan, since the use of a fan creates a flow of air through the housing and across the carrier material where vapors from the material are drawn into the air flow through the housing and is exhausted into the ambient environment as shown by Demarest (col.8, lines 61-67).

Regarding claims 31-32, Triplett teaches that the volatile material is fragrance or insecticide (col.4, lines 43-46).

Regarding to claim 33, Triplett teaches that the volatile liquid container (figure 3:14) is releasably secured (col.3, lines 56-58) to the housing (figure 3:12).

Regarding claim 35, Triplett in view of Demarest does not teach that the wick (figure 6:210) is in alignment with the fan (figure 6:260. The wick and the fan are considered in alignment with the imaginary z-axis) to immerse the wick into the air stream (the upper part of wick 210 is considered to be immersed in the air stream created by fan 260 in figure 6), because a fan creates an airstream that entrains the evaporated liquid formulation and assists in the dispersion of the chemical active into the surrounding environment (col.4, lines 49-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to align the wick with the fan in the modified device of Triplett in order to improve distribution of the volatile liquid.

**17.** Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Triplett et al (U.S.P.N. 6,697,571) in view of Demarest et al (U.S.P.N. 6,361,752) and

further in view of Gillett et al (U.S.P.N. 5,402,517) and He et al (US 2002/0136886 A1) as applied to claim 25 and further in view of in view of Lang (U.S.P.N. 7,018,644).

Triplett, Demarest, Gillett, and He are silent with regard to specifically disclosing a relative evaporation rate. Lang discloses air freshener and insecticidal liquid compositions that are used in air freshening evaporative devices (col.1, lines 15-18) where the composition is made up of a polar solvent, non-polar solvent, and a fragrance or an insecticide (col.2, lines 64-67). The components of the composition have evaporation rates that are relative to n-butyl acetate (co.4, lines 15-25 or col.6, lines 8-9. This is considered the relative evaporation rate) as such (See the Table in Example 1. For example, a non-polar solvent ,Isopar M, has a relative evaporation rate of less than 1, and a polar solvent, Dowanol DPM, has a relative evaporation rate of 3) it is particularly desirable for the composition to be formulated such that no residue of the solvent remains (col.2, lines 51-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further provide the article of manufacture in Triplett with the polar/non-polar liquid composition, because upon complete evaporation no residues of the solvent remains within the device as taught by Lang (col.2, lines 51-55).

**18.** Claims 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Triplett et al (U.S.P.N. 6,697,571) in view of Demarest et al (U.S.P.N. 6,361,752) and further in view of Gillett et al (U.S.P.N. 5,402,517) and He et al (US 2002/0136886 A1) as applied to claim 25 and further in view of Ito et al (U.S.P.N. 6,391,329).

Regarding claims 29-30, Triplett, Demarest, Gillett, and He do not specifically teach the use of a fan that is operated intermittently. Ito's insecticide device uses a fan (figure 1:3) that is operated intermittently (col.12, lines 58-60) in order to attain an equilibrium concentration within the first 30-minute period and thereafter keeps releasing uniformly and stably over 360 hours (col.13, lines 6-10). Furthermore, Ito's fan is capable of operating the air stream in an on and off of different ratio time intervals, including the ratio time interval of about 1 minute to 3 minutes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the article of manufacture in Triplett with an intermittent operating fan in order to attain an equilibrium concentration within the first 30-minute period and thereafter keeps releasing uniformly and stably over 360 hours as taught by Ito (col.13, lines 6-10).

**19.** Claims 34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Triplett et al (U.S.P.N. 6,697,571) in view of Demarest et al (U.S.P.N. 6,361,752) and further in view of Gillett et al (U.S.P.N. 5,402,517) and He et al (US 2002/0136886 A1).

Regarding claim 34, Triplett, Demarest, and He are silent with respect to the amount of the volatile material used. Gillett discloses a fragrance vaporizing apparatus (col.1, lines 8-9) having a cylindrical housing (figure 1:48) into which a suitable amount of volatile liquid material between 1 to 20 ml is added (col.4, lines 29-30), since within this volume range of volatile material, the heating element is able to control the rate of vaporization of the chemical agent and thereby extend the dispensing of the fragrance material well over 30 days (col.1, lines 26-30 and col.3, lines 35-37). It would have been



obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further provide an amount of volatile material between 1 to 20 ml into the reservoir unit of the modified device of Triplett, since within this volume range of volatile material, the heating element is able to control the rate of vaporization of the chemical agent and thereby extend the dispensing of the fragrance material well over 30 days as explained by Gillett (col.1, lines 26-30 and col.3, lines 35-37).

Regarding claim 36, Triplett, Demarest, and Gillett are silent about disclosing range values for the mean pore size of wicks. He dispenses fragrance material [0011] using polymeric wicks [0009] having average pore size from about 2 to about 70 microns [0057], because in such a pore range polymeric wicks showed no substantial fluid leakage upon inversion [0055]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the modified article of manufacture in Triplett with a wick having an average pore size from about 2 to about 70 microns in order to have a polymeric wick that shows no substantial fluid leakage upon inversion as taught by He [0055].

**20.** Claims 37-38 and 44-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Triplett et al (U.S.P.N. 6,697,571) in view of Lang (U.S.P.N. 7,018,644).

Regarding claim 37, Triplett discloses an article of manufacture (figure 3:10) that is plugged in a conventional electrical outlet (col.4, lines 60-62) comprising: a housing (figure 3:12); the volatile liquid in a reservoir (col.4, lines 42-46), a wick (22) extending from the reservoir upwardly in the housing, and a heater (20) in the housing, electrically

connected to the plug unit (18). The volatile liquid has an evaporation rate between about  $5.0 \times 10^{-9}$  and about  $10.0 \times 10^{-9}$  meters per second measured where the top of the wick is at a distance 1.5 cm from the top of the heating element. Using a wick length of 1.0 cm (the wick is considered to have a certain volume of fragrance present within it), which represent the amount of exposed wick that is considered to contain an initial amount of fragrance at the first day of 15 days time interval and dividing 1.0 cm by 15 days, the rate of evaporation is  $7 \times 10^{-9}$  m/s. See Table 2. This rate falls within the claimed range. Calculation is done as follows:  $(1\text{cm}/15\text{days}) \times (1\text{day}/1440\text{min}) \times (1\text{min}/60\text{sec}) \times (0.01\text{m}/1\text{cm}) = 7 \times 10^{-9}$  m/s. As to the newly added unit of  $(\text{m}^3/\text{m}^2)/\text{s}$ , further division of the units in this compound fracture results in having the unit as m/s, which is the same as the unit provided in the calculations in the Triplett reference.

With respect to the measurement and calculation of the evaporation rate being done by drop shape analysis based on 30% of the volatile liquid remaining at room temperature, Triplett is silent. However, the evaporation rate of the solution based on about 30% remaining liquid at room temperature is considered a limitation which is not attributable to the device being claimed. As such, the measurement and calculation method employed is not given any patentable weight in a claim to the device.

Triplett does not specifically teach values for relative evaporation rates. Lang discloses air freshener and insecticidal liquid compositions that are used in air freshening evaporative devices (col.1, lines 15-18) where the composition is made up of a polar solvent, non-polar solvent, and a fragrance or an insecticide (col.2, lines 64-67). The components of the composition have evaporation rates that are relative to n-butyl

acetate (co.4, lines 15-25 or col.6, lines 8-9. This is considered the relative evaporation rate) as such (See the Table in Example 1. For example, a non-polar solvent ,Isopar M, has a relative evaporation rate of less than 1, and a polar solvent, Dowanol DPM, has a relative evaporation rate of 3) it is particularly desirable for the composition to be formulated such that no residue of the solvent remains (col.2, lines 51-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further provide the apparatus in Triplett with the polar/non-polar liquid composition, because upon complete evaporation no residues of the solvent remains within the device (col.2, lines 51-55).

Regarding claim 38, Triplett discloses an evaporation rate between about  $1.0 \times 10^{-8}$  to about  $7.0 \times 10^{-8}$  meters per second. See Table 2, where the top of the wick (the wick is considered to have a certain volume of fragrance present within it) is at a distance 1.5 cm from the top of the heating element. Using 1.0 cm, which represent the amount of exposed wick that is considered to contain an initial amount of fragrance at the first day of 7 days time interval and dividing 1.0 cm by 7 days, the rate of evaporation is  $1.6 \times 10^{-8}$  m/s. This rate falls within the claimed range. Calculation is done as follows:  $(1\text{cm}/7\text{days}) \times (1\text{day}/1440\text{min}) \times (1\text{ min}/60\text{sec}) \times (0.01\text{m}/1\text{cm}) = 1.6 \times 10^{-8}$  m/s]. Within the reservoir (figure 3:14) is used to measure the rate of evaporation. As to the newly added unit of  $(\text{m}^3/\text{m}^2)/\text{s}$ , further division of the units in this compound fracture results in having the unit as m/s, which is the same as the unit provided in the calculations in the Triplett reference.

Regarding claims 44-45, Triplett teaches that the volatile material is fragrance or insecticide (col.4, lines 43-46).

Regarding claim 46, Triplett teaches that the volatile liquid container (figure 3:14) is releasably secured (col.3, lines 56-58) to the housing (figure 3:12).

Regarding claim 47, as to the limitation that about 90% of the volatile liquid is capable of evaporating through the wick between within one and two months under ambient conditions when the wick is exposed to the surrounding environment, Triplett exposes the wick (figure 3:22) to the surrounding environment (wick 14 is exposed to the surrounding environment through vent system 16 as shown in figure 3). Triplett further teaches (col.7, lines 16-19) that the amount of evaporation of the fragrance is over 62 days or less (see table 2 and col.7, lines 16-19). As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that at least 90% of the volatile liquid must evaporate within 2 months. Therefore, 90% of the volatile liquid material is capable of evaporating through the wick within one and two months under ambient conditions within the modified device of Triplett.

**21.** Claims 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Triplett et al (U.S.P.N. 6,697,571) in view of Lang (U.S.P.N. 7,018,644) as applied to claim 37 and further in view of Demarest (U.S.P.N. 6,361,752).

Triplett and Lang do not specifically disclose using a fan. Demarest discloses a volatile liquid vaporizing device (figure 9:130) using a fan (figure 9:156), since the use of a fan creates a flow of air through the housing and across the carrier material where vapors from the material are drawn into the air flow through the housing and is

exhausted into the ambient environment (col.8, lines 61-67). In addition, Demarest's fan is capable of exhibiting various throughputs volumetric flow rates including the range of about 0.4 cubic feet per minute to about 0.45 cubic feet per minute. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further provide a fan into the housing of Triplett, since the use of a fan creates a flow of air through the housing and across the carrier material where vapors from the material are drawn into the air flow through the housing and is exhausted into the ambient environment as shown by Demarest (col.8, lines 61-67).

**22.** Claims 42-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Triplett et al (U.S.P.N. 6,697,571) in view of Lang (U.S.P.N. 7,018,644) as applied to claim 37 and further in view of Ito et al (U.S.P.N. 6,391,329).

Regarding claims 42-43, Triplett and Lang do not specifically teach the use of a fan that is operated intermittently. Ito's insecticide device uses a fan (figure 1:3) that is operated intermittently (col.12, lines 58-60) in order to attain an equilibrium concentration within the first 30-minute period and thereafter keeps releasing uniformly and stably over 360 hours (col.13, lines 6-10). Furthermore, Ito's fan is capable of operating the air stream in an on and off of different ratio time intervals, including the ratio time interval of about 1 minute to 3 minutes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the article of manufacture in Triplett with an intermittent operating fan in order to attain an equilibrium concentration within the first 30-minute period and thereafter keeps releasing uniformly and stably over 360 hours as taught by Ito (col.13, lines 6-10).

**23.** Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Triplett et al (U.S.P.N. 6,697,571) in view of Lang (U.S.P.N. 7,018,644) as applied to claim 37 and further in view of He et al (US 2002/0136886 A1).

Triplett and Lang are silent about disclosing range values for the mean pore size of wicks. He dispenses fragrance material [0011] using polymeric wicks [0009] having average pore size from about 2 to about 70 microns [0057], because in such a pore range polymeric wicks showed no substantial fluid leakage upon inversion [0055]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the article of manufacture in Triplett with a wick having an average pore size from about 2 to about 70 microns in order to have a polymeric wick that shows no substantial fluid leakage upon inversion as taught by He [0055].

***Response to Arguments***

**24.** Applicant's arguments see pages 10-11 of the Remarks/Arguments, filed on 5/19/08, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 25-36 under obviousness over Triplett in view of Demarest, Gillett, and Pedrotti have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Triplett in view of Demarest, Gillett, and He et al.

On pages 10-11 of the Remarks/Arguments; Applicant argues that Triplett does not expose the wick to the surrounding environment, but rather uses a heater and that the examiner calculations consist of a one-dimensional measure of length over time

(m/s) and does not account for the change in volume ( $m^3$ ) per surface area ( $m^2$ ) over time (s).

The instant claims do not exclude the use of heater and Triplett does expose wick 22 to the outside environment through vent openings 16 as shown in figure 3. The volatile liquid has an evaporation rate between about  $5.0 \times 10^{-9}$  and about  $10.0 \times 10^{-9}$  meters per second measured where the top of the wick is at a distance 1.5 cm from the top of the heating element. Using a wick length of 1.0 cm (the wick is considered to have a certain volume of fragrance present within it), which represent the amount of exposed wick that is considered to contain an initial amount of fragrance at the first day of 15 days time interval and dividing 1.0 cm by 15 days, the rate of evaporation is  $7 \times 10^{-9}$  m/s. See Table 2. This rate falls within the claimed range. Calculation is done as follows:  $(1\text{cm}/15\text{days}) \times (1\text{day}/1440\text{min}) \times (1\text{min}/60\text{sec}) \times (0.01\text{m}/1\text{cm}) = 7 \times 10^{-9}$  m/s. As to the newly added unit of  $(m^3/m^2)/s$ , further division of the units in this compound fracture results in having the unit as m/s, which is the same as the unit provided in the calculations in the Triplett reference.

### ***Conclusion***

**25.** Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MONZER R. CHORBAJI whose telephone number is (571)272-1271. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

**26.** If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on (571) 272-1267. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

27. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. R. C./

/Jill Warden/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797